



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/671,024

09/24/2003

David Sheldon Hooper

06769.P002X

7853

7590

08/11/2006

James C. Scheller, Jr.
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

TRAN, TUYETLIEN T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2179

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/671,024	Applicant(s) HOOPER ET AL.	
	Examiner Tuyetlien T. Tran	Art Unit 2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 42 is objected to because of the following informalities: typing error. It is believed the word "the" is not needed in the first line of claim 42.

It is the best interest of the patent community that applicant, in his/her normal review and /or rewriting of the claims, to take into consideration these editorial situations and make changes as necessary.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-8, 18-29 and 41-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As to claim 1, 18 and 41, a "system" is being recited; however, as disclosed by the specification, a system is taught to be software, per se. A computer program with no structural and functional interrelationship between computer elements is computer software by itself.

Claims 2-8, 19-28 and 42-45 are rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of a claim upon which it depends.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2179

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-19, 23-27, 29-30, 34-38, and 40 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moore et. al. (Pub No. US 2004/0189707 A1, hereinafter Moore).

As to claim 1, Moore teaches:

A system for operation and visualization of multiple content filters (a system for filtering and organizing items from computer memories, see [0013] lines 1-3), comprising:

a plurality of interfaces (interfaces for filter by date, by location, by category; see Fig. 36 located on the left side of the display 600) for content filters that filter (see [0013] lines 4-5) a catalog of assets (group of items in libraries, such as photos, music, document, see [0018] lines 2-5 or Fig. 36 items 971-975), each interface including at least one control (pull down control menu, see Fig. 28 item 623A) for setting at least one content filter parameter (i.e., pull down menu 623A allows a user to select or set date filter parameter, see Fig. 28 item 623A);

a filter activation interface ('filter by' item 620, see Fig. 10 item 620 located on the left side of the display 600) for activating at least one of said content filters (i.e., selecting any filters 621-625 from the list 620, see Fig. 10); and

a display interface (display area located on the right side of the display 600, see Fig. 12) for viewing a result of application of the activated content filters to the catalog of assets (i.e., the display are only shows items that corresponds to the filter term, see [0015] lines 4-7).

As to claim 9, this claim differs from claim 1 only in that claim 9 is a method claim whereas, claim 1 is a system claim. Thus claim 9 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

As to claim 17, this claim differs from claim 1 only in that claim 17 is a method claim with a computer readable medium storing program code (see Moore Fig. 1 or [0068] lines 1-5) whereas, claim 1 is a system claim. Thus claim 17 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

As to claim 18, Moore teaches:

A system for retrieval of digital assets having metadata associated therewith (metadata-based view system, see [0065] lines 7-10), comprising:

an interface (interface 600, see Fig. 10) for generating a plurality of metadata constraints (i.e., date filter 622, category filter 625, see Fig. 10; it is noted that filters are defined as metadata constraints, see [0014] lines 6-12), and for activating at least one generated metadata constraint (selecting any filters 621-625 from the 'Filter by' list, see [0014] lines 8-12 or Fig. 10);

a query processor (folder processor, see step 324 Fig. 4) for applying the activated metadata constraints (e.g., the folder processor constructs a query object

Art Unit: 2179

based on metadata constraints and then passes it to a database, see [0089] lines 8-10);
and

a display interface (display area located on the right side of the display 600, see Fig. 12) for viewing a result of said query processor (i.e., the display area only shows items that corresponds to the filter term, see [0015] lines 4-7).

As to claim 29, this claim differs from claim 18 only in that claim 29 is a method claim whereas, claim 18 is a system claim. Thus claim 29 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 18 above.

As to claim 40, this claim differs from claim 18 only in that claim 40 is a method claim with a computer readable medium storing program code (see Moore Fig. 1 or [0068] lines 1-5) whereas, claim 18 is a system claim. Thus claim 40 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 18 above.

As to claim 2, Moore teaches wherein the content filters are filters for digital files (i.e., documents, photo, video, see Fig. 36 items 971-973).

As to claim 3, Moore teaches wherein the content filters are filters for digital image files (i.e., photo, see Fig. 36 item 972).

As to claim 4, Moore teaches wherein the content filters include a folder based filter (item 616, see Fig. 18).

As to claim 5, Moore teaches wherein the content filters include a category based filter (item 610 or item 625, see Fig. 10).

As to claim 6, Moore teaches wherein the content filters include a calendar based filter (items 622 and 623, see Fig. 10).

As to claim 7, Moore teaches wherein the content filters include a location based filter (filter by location - 'pick a location', see Fig. 36 located on the left side of the display 600).

As to claim 10, this claim differs from claim 2 only in that claim 10 is a method claim whereas, claim 2 is a system claim. Thus claim 10 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 2 above.

As to claim 11, this claim differs from claim 3 only in that claim 11 is a method claim whereas, claim 3 is a system claim. Thus claim 11 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 3 above.

As to claim 12, this claim differs from claim 4 only in that claim 12 is a method claim whereas, claim 4 is a system claim. Thus claim 12 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 4 above.

As to claim 13, this claim differs from claim 5 only in that claim 13 is a method claim whereas, claim 5 is a system claim. Thus claim 13 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 5 above.

As to claim 14, this claim differs from claim 6 only in that claim 14 is a method claim whereas, claim 6 is a system claim. Thus claim 14 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 6 above.

As to claim 15, this claim differs from claim 7 only in that claim 15 is a method claim whereas, claim 7 is a system claim. Thus claim 15 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 7 above.

As to claim 19, Moore teaches wherein metadata includes file system data (type of file information, see [0074] lines 3-4 and Fig. 36).

As to claim 23, Moore teaches wherein the plurality of metadata constraints (i.e., filter term, see [0014] lines 7-12) include at least one constraint (category filter 625, see Fig. 10) on category metadata (e.g., category filter 625 allows a user to filter according to a selected category information, see [0104] lines 12-15).

As to claim 24, Moore teaches wherein the plurality of metadata constraints include at least one constraint on property metadata (filter terms are built based on metadata properties, see [0014] lines 7-12).

As to claim 25, Moore teaches wherein said interface is used for saving a group of at least one metadata constraint as a filter (i.e., a user might filter down to all of the document that they modified in January 2003, and then could save that as a quick link 'January Work', see [0016] lines 9-12).

As to claim 26, Moore teaches wherein said interface is also used for de-activating at least one generated metadata constraint (i.e., when a user click on the quick link 'All folders', the interface 600 will de-activate other filters and show all folders on the display, see Fig. 17 or [0016]).

As to claim 27, Moore teaches wherein said interface is also used for modifying at least one generated metadata constraint (i.e., users can modify 'All document' quick link and create their own one - 'January 2003', see Fig. 20 and [0016]).

As to claim 30, this claim differs from claim 19 only in that claim 30 is a method claim whereas, claim 19 is a system claim. Thus claim 30 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 19 above.

As to claim 34, this claim differs from claim 23 only in that claim 34 is a method claim whereas, claim 23 is a system claim. Thus claim 34 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 23 above.

As to claim 35, this claim differs from claim 24 only in that claim 35 is a method claim whereas, claim 24 is a system claim. Thus claim 35 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 24 above.

As to claim 36, this claim differs from claim 25 only in that claim 36 is a method claim whereas, claim 25 is a system claim. Thus claim 36 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 25 above.

As to claim 37, this claim differs from claim 26 only in that claim 37 is a method claim whereas, claim 26 is a system claim. Thus claim 37 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 26 above.

As to claim 38, this claim differs from claim 27 only in that claim 38 is a method claim whereas, claim 27 is a system claim. Thus claim 38 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 27 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore in view of <http://Fototime.com/ftweb/fahelp/> (published web pages, "212.htm", '138.htm', '210.htm', hereinafter Fototime).

As to claim 8, Moore teaches the limitation of claim 1 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1 above. Moore further teaches that the filter activation interface includes a list of the plurality of content filters (e.g., filters 621-625 are sub-items of filter activation interface 'Filter by', see Fig. 10). Moore fails to teach that the

filter activation interface includes a list of check boxes for selectively activating each content filter.

Fototime teaches wherein the filter activation interface includes a list of the plurality of content filters, with check boxes for selectively activating each content filter (e.g., frame 'Other Filters' has 4 check boxes that allows a user to select optional filter such as pictures or video filters, see Figure on web page 212.htm).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the filter activation feature using check boxes menu as taught by Fototime to the system of filtering digital items as taught by Moore to create a more user-friendly and more user-convenient graphical user interface to ultimately attract more users (see Fototime Figure on page 212.htm).

As to claim 16, this claim differs from claim 8 only in that claim 16 is a method claim whereas, claim 8 is a system claim. Thus claim 16 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 8 above.

7. Claims 20-22, 28, 31-33, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore in view of Drucker et al. (Pub No. US 2006/0161867 A1, hereinafter Drucker).

As to claim 20, Moore teaches the limitation of claim 18 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claim 18 above. Moore fails to teach that metadata includes data assigned by a capture device.

Drucker teaches wherein metadata includes data assigned by a capture device (intrinsic metadata such as creation date, see [0006] lines 7-12; i.e., a creation date of a photo is embedded by a digital camera when the photo is taken).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the filtering component based on intrinsic metadata as taught by Drucker to the system of filtering digital items as taught by Moore for facilitating browsing, sorting, clustering, and filtering any number of digital documents with metadata embedded grouped together in a quick and easy manner (see Drucker [0006] lines 1-4).

As to claim 21, Moore teaches the limitation of claim 18 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claim 18 above. Moore fails to teach that metadata includes user assigned data.

Drucker teaches wherein metadata includes user assigned data (extrinsic metadata such as creation date, see [0006] lines 7-12; it should be noted that extrinsic metadata for a media object can be assigned by a user, see [0006] lines 11-13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the filtering function based on extrinsic metadata as taught by Drucker to the system of filtering digital items as taught by Moore for facilitating browsing, sorting, clustering, and filtering any number of digital documents with NO metadata embedded grouped together in a quick and easy manner (see Drucker [0006] lines 1-4).

As to claim 22, Moore teaches the limitation of claim 18 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claim 18 above. Moore fails to teach that metadata constraints include constraints on date and time metadata.

Drucker teaches wherein the plurality of metadata constraints include at least one constraint on date and time metadata (i.e., time clusters scroll bar 1930, see Fig. 24 and [0126]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used constraint on date and time metadata as taught by Drucker to the system of filtering digital items as taught by Moore for facilitating browsing, sorting, clustering, and filtering any number of digital documents based on date and time metadata in a quick and easy manner (see Drucker [0006] lines 1-4 and Fig. 24).

As to claim 28, Moore teaches the limitation of claim 27 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claim 27 above. Moore fails to teach a constraint lock processor for locking at least one metadata constraint so as to remain activated when other metadata constraints are activated, de-activated or modified.

Drucker teaches further comprising a constraint lock processor (i.e., software component that controls the state of illuminated or normal, see [0126]) for locking at least one metadata constraint so as to remain activated when other metadata constraints are activated, de-activated or modified (i.e., video filter 1920 and photos filter 1925, when selected or illuminated, specify the content of media objects present in the display area 1905, see [0126] and Fig. 24; e.g., when the video and photo buttons,

when highlighted, remains activated when time-based scroll bar 1935 is activated or deactivated or modified, see [0126]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the constraint lock processor function as taught by Drucker to the system of filtering digital items as taught by Moore to allow a user to browse less media objects, thus increase focus on desired items in order to search items in a quicker and more effective way (see Drucker Fig. 17 steps 1720 and 1730).

As to claim 31, this claim differs from claim 20 only in that claim 31 is a method claim whereas, claim 20 is a system claim. Thus claim 31 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 20 above.

As to claim 32, this claim differs from claim 21 only in that claim 32 is a method claim whereas, claim 21 is a system claim. Thus claim 32 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 21 above.

As to claim 33, this claim differs from claim 22 only in that claim 33 is a method claim whereas, claim 22 is a system claim. Thus claim 33 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 22 above.

As to claim 39, this claim differs from claim 28 only in that claim 39 is a method claim whereas, claim 28 is a system claim. Thus claim 39 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 28 above.

8. Claims 41, 42, 44-47, and 49-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drucker in view of Fototime.

As to claim 41 Drucker teaches:

A system for operation and visualization of multiple content filters (a system for browsing and filtering media objects, see [0006] lines 1-4), comprising:

a plurality of filter interfaces (filter interfaces 1930 and 1935, see Fig. 19) for setting parameters (i.e., moving the slider left and right will set parameters, see Fig. 24) of corresponding content filters that filter a catalog of assets (media objects group together, see [0006] line 2), each content filter having a lock status being in a locked or an unlocked state (i.e., video filter 1920, when illuminated, indicates that the status is locked or unlocked when it is not highlighted, see [0126]), and each filter interface having a display generator for rendering a user interface display (i.e., video filter 1920 is rendered illuminated when activated, see Fig. 24); and

a lock processor for setting the lock status of at least one content filter (i.e., software component that sets the status of video filter 1920 from normal to illuminated to indicate un-locked or lock status respectively, see Fig. 24 or [0126]).

Drucker fails to teach that the user interface for the filter is dependent upon the lock status of another content filter.

Fototime teaches wherein at least one such user interface display for a content filter (group filter interface, see Figure on page 138.htm) is dependent upon the lock status of another content filter (i.e., date filter user interface can be combined with group

filter; e.g., items displayed in group filter interface is dependent on what date range is selected from date filter, see page 138.htm lines 15-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the technique of rendering a filter user interface based on another filter as taught by Fototime to the system of browsing and filtering media objects as taught by Drucker to control exactly what pictures you want to see for searching more quicker and more effectively (see Fototime page 138.htm lines 15-17).

As to claim 46, this claim differs from claim 41 only in that claim 46 is a method claim whereas, claim 41 is a system claim. Thus claim 46 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 41 above.

As to claim 51, this claim differs from claim 41 only in that claim 51 is a method claim with a computer readable medium storing program code (see Drucker pp. 18 lines 12-14) whereas, claim 41 is a system claim. Thus claim 51 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 41 above.

As to claim 42, Drucker and Fototime teach the limitation of claim 41 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claim 41 above. Fototime further teaches wherein the at least one user interface display contains at least one alphanumeric string dependent upon the lock status of another content filter (i.e., 'Trips to Europe' see Fototime page 138.htm). Thus, combining Drucker and Fototime would meet the claim limitation for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 41 above.

As to claim 44, Drucker and Fototime teach the limitation of claim 41 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claim 41 above. Drucker further teaches wherein parameters of the content filters (e.g., time-based scroll bar filter 1935, see Fig. 24) are set in a sequential order (i.e., scroll bar parameters are listed from earlier date to later date, see Fig. 24 item 1935), and wherein said lock processor locks (i.e., software component that sets the status of video filter 1920 from normal to illuminated to indicate un-locked or lock status respectively, see Fig. 24 or [0126]) previously set content filters (i.e., when video 1920 is illuminated, only items of video type are shown in the display area, see [0126]).

As to claim 45, Drucker and Fototime teach the limitation of claim 41 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claim 41 above. Drucker further teaches wherein parameters of the content filters (e.g., time-based scroll bar filter 1935, see Fig. 24) are set in a sequential order (i.e., scroll bar parameters are listed from earlier date to later date, see Fig. 24 item 1935), and wherein said lock processor unlocks (i.e., software component that sets the status of video filter 1920 from normal to illuminated to indicate un-locked or lock status respectively, see Fig. 24 or [0126]) previously set content filters (i.e., when video 1920 is NOT illuminated, all type of items are shown in the display area, see [0126]).

As to claim 47, this claim differs from claim 42 only in that claim 47 is a method claim whereas, claim 42 is a system claim. Thus claim 47 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 42 above.

As to claim 49, this claim differs from claim 44 only in that claim 49 is a method claim whereas, claim 44 is a system claim. Thus claim 49 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 44 above.

As to claim 50, this claim differs from claim 45 only in that claim 50 is a method claim whereas, claim 45 is a system claim. Thus claim 50 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 45 above.

9. Claims 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drucker in view of Fototime further in view of Graham et al. (published article, "Time as Essence for Photo Browsing Through Personal Digital Libraries", pp. 326-335; hereinafter Graham).

As to claim 43, Drucker and Fototime teach the limitation of claim 41 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claim 41 above. Drucker and Fototime fail to teach that the alphanumeric string is a statistic about the catalog of assets filtered according to locked content filters.

Graham teaches wherein the alphanumeric string is a statistic about the catalog of assets filtered according to locked content filters (i.e., number displayed next to the year, month, or date indicates the number of items within, see Graham Fig. 5, pp. 331; Further noted that the number displayed next to year 2001 is equal to all the numbers from the months or dates within that year added together, see Fig. 5, pp. 331).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the technique of displaying the statistic about the catalog of assets filtered based on another filter on a filter user interface as taught by Graham to the system of browsing and filtering media objects as taught by Drucker in view of Fototime to allow a user to see in a first glance how many items included and further help the user searches quicker and more effectively (see Graham page 331, Fig. 5).

As to claim 48, this claim differs from claim 43 only in that claim 48 is a method claim whereas, claim 43 is a system claim. Thus claim 48 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 43 above.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Publication No. US 2004/0267700 A1 is cited to teach a method and system for content-access-based information retrieval.

Publication No. US 2003/0033296 A1 is cited to teach a method and apparatus for finding and displaying digital images.

Publication No. US 2004/0027931 A1 is cited to teach an apparatus for information processing including audio play list.

Publication No. US 2006/0077461 A1 is cited to teach a method of adding metadata to acquired image information from image capture device.

Publication No. US 2005/0160113 A1 is cited to teach a system for navigating primary media and metadata on a computer system.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuyetlien T. Tran whose telephone number is 571-270-1033. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday: 7:30 - 5:00 (every other Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chanh D. Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-7772. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

L.T
8/01/06

Lien Tran
Examiner
Art Unit 2179



CHANH D. NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER